

# CANDOUR

*The British  
Views - Letter*

*To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance*

Vol XLV Nos 6 & 7

*Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper*

June/July 1993

## **The A.B.C. of Politics**

### **NEVER IN THE NEWS - UNTIL IT IS HISTORY**

**by Rosine de Bounevialle**

THE adult innocents at home and abroad who largely make up the so-called Western nations appear to be nearly, if not wholly, convinced that accurate and detailed information is conveyed through the media on every subject - even politics - though it may be thought necessary, perhaps, to read several newspapers and listen and look at a selection of the newscasts and comment that abounds on radio and television to obtain a "balanced" view of the current happenings that will, they imagine, mature into history.

Nothing, it seems, will change the generally held opinion that at least one or more of the broadsheets will report without bias upon the day-to-day doings, triumphal or disastrous, of the famous or infamous that occur in all spheres thought to be of interest to the public at large. And yet, and yet... "Mud sticks" and "out of sight, out of mind" are two aphorisms that might give us pause when we consider who and what are celebrated ad nauseam or, alternatively, sunk without trace, and how much deserving of either extreme are the subjects selected for the treatment.

## **The Ubiquitous, Iniquitous U.N.**

One has only to listen to a David Irving lecture to realise that what is passed down to posterity as history via the media, as often as not, bears little or no relation to the facts of the history it is intended to distort. The myth of the Holocaust is now probably too famously infamous to need any more refutation, but lately the public has been daily bludgeoned with "news" of the absolute necessity for intervention by the United Nations in the internal affairs of various countries in Europe, Asia and Africa supposed to be incapable of managing for themselves; none is too little known or too far away for international attention.

It is iterated and reiterated that only action on the part of the "peace-makers" of the U.N. can curtail the dreadful consequences occasioned by the crack-up of communist and/or colonial control. The U.N. must "save" refugees, presumably by removing them to become problems elsewhere; the U.N. must make "peace plans" and bring about "cease fires" in the various war zones by the use of some extremely irregular troops having nothing in common but the blue beret, and all apparently directed by the likes of the mysteriously surviving Owens and Carringtons, whose recurring failures are blandly explained away as necessary stumbling blocks on the road to universal peace.



Latest it appears that the interloping forces being subjected to lethal attacks by "the natives" have been given licence to defend the "peace" by engaging in retaliatory war! Some "natives", of course, are less intimidating than others. The shambolic U.S.-led peace forces, though possibly capable of dealing with Somali clans, have not yet dared to intervene in Europe, since Europeans have always been the toughest opponents, which is why they have so often been tricked into fighting one another instead of combining against the universal enemy whose chosen aim is to mongrelise the world.

What a shambles is presently in prospect, but why should anyone be surprised? Some of us have seen this scenario before, but it has only recently become "history" and thus to rate media mention.

On February 26th there appeared in the **Daily Mail** under the banner headline, ONLY GOD CAN SAVE OUR NATION NOW, an expose of the past and present condition of the erstwhile Belgian Congo, the dolorous nature of whose "freedom" caused the **Mail** correspondent, Ann Leslie, to say: "What even ten years ago was unsayable: 'independence' has been a disaster for Africa."

### **Murder, Mayhem and Mansions**

Only now do we read that Zaire, once the Belgian Congo, has "the biggest thief in history" as president for life, put into power by a C.I.A.-backed coup in 1965; so that twenty-eight years later even the media tycoons cannot prevent some truth welling out. The Congo has been disintegrating for all that time. Road and rail networks return to the jungle; telephones and turbines are almost moribund; schools and hospitals collapse because, said some engineer, "the word 'maintenance' exists only in two African languages - English and Afrikaans." Although this robber president makes European insider traders look like public benefactors, the West continued to pour aid into his coffers despite the outrageous scandals of the Mobutu murder and mayhem accompanying his wholesale confiscation of his country's wealth translated into chateaux, mansions, castles and cash in Switzerland, France, Belgium, Spain and Portugal.

Even this tale of Black barbarism cannot be reported without a swipe at the Christian monarch and his people who built a country worth pillaging.

"A century ago," claims Ms Leslie, "the image which haunted the nightmares of the people living on the crocodile-infested banks of the Congo River was that of Queen Victoria's cousin, the rapacious King Leopold of the Belgians, whose agents smoked the heads of recalcitrant slaves and stuck them on picket fences." Wot? Not in gas chambers? "Today," says the gullible Ms Leslie, "King Leopold has a worthy successor in the man who now rules the former Belgian Congo."

So what did happen in the Congo in the 1960s when it was "in the news"? The Belgians were subjected to the now familiar liberal campaign for the liberalisation of oppressed peoples, animals, birds, fish, butterflies, bats and bears. No matter that they had established and governed a happy, prosperous, peaceful state out of the immemorial darkness that was Africa before the White man came. They were tricked or bribed away from their responsibility and the immediate result was insurrection, mutiny in the army, rebellion and rapine following so



closely upon one another as to give the unmistakable impression of long term planning effected other than in the jungle.

Murder, pillage and the inevitable raping of White women, plus the last rebuff: the refusal of the British Government to allow military assistance to be sent from Northern Rhodesia when it was requested by Tshombe, the Katangan leader, to help him protect his people and the White refugees from the chaos of neighbouring Congo. That brought the final panic scramble of the remaining Europeans to refuge in neighbouring states, whilst the triumphant mutineers ran amok and the rest of Black Africa rejoiced at the Whites' abject humiliation.

Enter the United Nations. Lumumba's Black republic was recognised and instantly made a member of the U.N. Immediately there was an allegedly spontaneous mutiny of the "Force Republique", whereupon the Force's Belgian C-in-C and all his Belgian officers were removed from duty and the "mutineers" set to work to terrorise the Belgian community and drive all Europeans out of the Congo. When the Belgian Government at last sent the Belgian troops into the territory again to restore order, Lumumba screamed that they were "making war on the Congolese people" and called for the United Nations troops to come to his assistance.

### Force Macabre

A.K. Chesterton's comment at the time was: "The composition of the first contingent of troops to be sent into the Congo represents for the Western European nations a kick in the teeth without precedent - an insult of such gigantic proportions that it is difficult to find words strong enough to describe it. The force was made up of soldiers from Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Sudan, Senegal and Tunisia. I do not know much about the Tunisians although one can guess what their outlook would be, but for the rest, the United Nations is sending savages to control savages. The Senegalese in the First World War did well at the Front, but their record of murder in the base areas of France was also formidable. Every European in the Congo will have been well advised to clear out before their protectors arrive."

To the macabre tunes called by the U.N.-U.S.-U.S.S.R. manifestation of the Money Power, the European civilisers abdicated one after another at the behest of their own governments, until today we are left with an "aid" and AIDS-ridden world, so obviously a disaster area that even what A.K. Chesterton called "our unpardonable press" has to say something other than "more of the same" - and what it has to say is unprecedented:

"There are no excuses left for Africa, no scapegoats from the past to blame any more. As the Ghanaian writer Ayi Kwei despairingly points out: 'The sons of the nation are now in charge after all'....When will the West come and save us?....But the West has 'cured' itself of colonialism - and by curing itself of this 'evil' it has, in effect, condemned a continent to a living death..."

Or is this bluff statement only permitted because the task of colonial and home demolition is reckoned to be completed and no man's land ready for occupation and control by the New World Order? Well may we all say: Only God can save our nation now. But He will not do it for cravens.



# TOWARDS WORLD SLAVERY

In 1981 Candour published a compilation of extracts from various articles identifying the extent to which the United Nations Organisation has been the instrument of arcane forces working to impose world dictatorship under the guise of "universal brotherhood and peace".

*It was the original intention of the internationalist pressure-groups working for one-world to bring about a global government via the instrument of the United Nations Organisation.*

"Her Majesty's Government are fully in agreement with world government. We agree that this must be the goal, and that every step that is humanly possible must be taken to reach that goal . . . To use the United Nations machinery for world government is obviously a goal . . ."

(Lord Gosford, in a speech for the Conservative Government in the House of Lords, *Hansard*, 7th November, 1957.)

"The United Nations . . . aspired to be . . . the embryonic World Government which has been planned for the enslavement of mankind. In the meantime, it busies itself with regulating the relationship with nations, while attempting to lay the foundations of the superstructure which will enable it in the not-too-distant future to exercise supreme power . . . The intention is no mere conjecture. Appearing in 1950 before a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in hearings entitled Revisions of United Nations Charter, James Paul Warburg of the powerful banking family said, ". . . a great question of our time is not whether or not One World can be achieved, but whether or not One World can be achieved by peaceful means. We shall have World Government whether or not we like it. The question is only whether World Government will be achieved by consent or conquest."

(A. K. Chesterton, in *The New Unhappy Lords*, 1965.)

*However, during the last couple of decades, the strategy employed by internationalists appears to have become much more pragmatic. Various "problems" in the world are to be identified — often after due precipitation — to which international solutions through one agency or another, like the proposed "new international economic order", will be devised, each entailing the surrender of some significant part of national sovereignty.*

"The plans have been changed and new means have been adopted for achieving that final goal: World Government, by whatever name. In the 1950s, the plan called for the gradual merging of the United States and the Soviet Union. The rest of the countries of the world — great and small, developed and under-developed, have and have-not

— were also to be merged with the United States and Russia, by means of a re-structured United Nations, or some similar World Administration. 'World Federalism' was the name of the game in the 1950s. But the plans began to change: the U.N. was being discredited; the rise of Japan and the rift between Russia and Red China altered the programming. Other factors entered to make the new planning necessary. The new plan: to build the World Administration from the bottom up, piece by piece, through unilateral, bilateral, trilateral and multilateral conferences, conventions, treaties, etc. That's why the Trilateral Commission was created: to build up the Global Community from the bottom up . . . So: new means to the same end which has never changed. That end: monopolise financial, economic, industrial, political and police power . . . Whatever the architects' and builders' change of plan, its organisation will still be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world."

Don Bell, 'War or Rumours of War or Both', in *Candour*, July 1977.)

"The world is not likely to unite (willingly) behind the common ideology and a super-government. The only practical hope is that it will now respond to a common concern for its own survival."

(Zigiew Brzezinski, in *Foreign Affairs*, journal of the Council on Foreign Relations.)

"World federalism and U.N. Charter review now seem bankrupt of possibilities . . . The hope lies not in building up a few ambitious central institutions of universal membership and general jurisdiction as was envisaged at the end of the last war, but rather in the much more decentralised, disorderly and pragmatic process of inventing or adapting institutions of limited jurisdiction and selected membership to deal with specific problems on a case-by-case basis, as the necessity for co-operation is perceived by the relevant nations . . . In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down."

(Professor Richard Gardner, 'The Hard Road to World Order', in *Foreign Affairs*, April 1974.)

\* \* \* \*

*The scheme for a "new international economic order", now widely publicised in the sinister Brandt Report, was first announced by Zbigniew Brzezinski, former director of the Rockefeller-financed Trilateral*



*Commission. It provides for a massive transfer of resources from industrial nations to the Third World, which will lead inevitably to a progressive reduction in Western living standards.*

"A series of world and regional conferences have been in virtually continuous session to realise the proposals approved by the United Nations [on the New International Economic Order] . . . The basic aim is to reduce, or at least hold down, restrictions by industrial countries on the imports of foodstuffs and of manufactured articles requiring large numbers of comparatively unskilled workers so they will be increasingly supplied by developing countries which can produce them most cheaply. This would obviously result in a more rapid decline in the developed nations, of industries such as textiles, clothing and footwear, which in countries like Britain have already been declining for years. One result would obviously be the closure of factories now making such goods in industrial countries, depriving exporters of their businesses and workers of their jobs . . . Poverty and unemployment will exist such as we have never known . . . Any nation that seeks to resist this will find itself under full United States economic and even military pressure. In this connection, the Kissinger plan for a World Food Bank would give High Finance the power to withhold food supplies and blackmail its opponents into submission. This plan calls for western food production to be concentrated in the United States and distributed through a World Food Bank. No more diabolical instrument for world enslavement can be envisaged."

(James Crossbow, 'The Looting of the West', in *On Target*.)

"The U.N. Agencies [are] concerned with industrialising the Third World — euphemistically referred to as 'development'. The World Bank, for example, was set up as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The purpose of this industrialisation is, of course, to eliminate subsistence economies . . . in order to bring such areas directly and wholly into the sphere of international finance-capitalism . . . Besides the direct loss of resources involved in foreign aid, there is also the long-term threat of crippling competition in the international markets by the use of cheap labour."

(Richard Lawson, 'The Population Plot', in *Spearhead*, May 1973.)

"Western elites are already working with the Communists to siphon off our wealth. That is already in black and white in the United Nations Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order . . . The 'Nineties are to

be the decade of 'Transformation' . . . The world community will become a welfare community in roughly the manner that Western states have become welfare states. As U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim told the World Food and Energy Conference, 'the time has come to think in terms of a redistribution of the wealth of the planet'."

(William Hoare, 'The New World Order', in *American Opinion*.)

\* \* \* \*

*The "universal brotherhood and peace" which the one-worlders claim they wish to bestow upon the nations of the world, irrespective of whether it assumes the form of a centralised authority or not, would amount to a world dictatorship exercising a remorseless tyranny over mankind.*

"Dr. Saul Mendlovitz, director of that important enterprise [the World Order Models Project] contends that there 'is no longer a question of whether or not there will be world government by the year 2,000. The questions are how it will come into being and whether it will be totalitarian, benign or participatory' . . . He contends we will need a world police force (which, of course, should control all arms) and other internationalist machinery to assure world government."

(Hoare, *op. cit.*)

"To achieve this [a world order] central institutions would have to be equipped with police capabilities, while national institutions would be substantially deprived of military capabilities."

(Professor Richard Falk, in *A Study of Future World*, 1975.)

"In their existential reality, human beings differ so widely that their natural and prudent political ordering is into units more limited and varied than a world state. A world state having no roots in human memory, feeling or custom, would inevitably be abstract and arbitrary, thus despotic, in the foreseeable future, if it could conceivably be brought into being."

(James Burnham, in *Suicide of the West*, 1967.)

"It should be clearly understood by all patriots that internationalist organisations such as the U.N. are not just sinister threats to national independence and individual freedom. Their common objective is the destruction of the nation-state and the substitution of a raceless, rootless, One World amorphous society incapable of resistance to tyranny because of the absence of any higher ideal engendered by racial pride or social tradition."

('A Tool of Communism', in *Frontline*, journal of the National Front of Australia, August 1980.)

### Essential Listening For All Patriots

A.K. CHESTERTON SPEAKS ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCE [C60] £4

AUSTEN BROOKS SPEAKS ON THE MENACE OF INTERNATIONALISM [C60] £4

Available from Candour Research Dept, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants



## BUILDING BRICKS IN THE "HOUSE OF WORLD ORDER"

The "house of world order", identified by Professor Richard Gardner as being built from the bottom up rather than from the top down, is being partly constructed from the non-governmental organisations whose current progeny numbers in the hundreds. All are directed in one way or another toward the New World Order, with its goal of eliminating nationhood and Christianity. One of the most prestigious [meaning in the original Latin *praestigium*, "deceptive", "illusory"] is the United Nations Association, United States of America.

The article below is reproduced from the U.N.A.-U.S.A.'s journal, **The Interdependent** [Summer 1992: Vol 18 no 3]. It is revealing in its description of how this particular non-governmental organisation seeks to exercise influence over U.S. Congress members in pursuit of its goal to shepherd mankind into the "brotherhood" of one-world.

Whether or not it constitutes part of what the late Senator Jenner called "the inner steering group" is impossible to say. Secret governments do not publish lists of their members and agents. Nevertheless, by virtue of its claim to "raise considerably the level of congressional and corporate ties to the United Nations and set a new standard of awareness among those communities", it is obvious that the U.N.A.-U.S.A. is a potentially powerful factor in the drive towards One World. We should recognise that the fight conducted by American patriots against its machinations is also our fight.

\*

## Merger creates new UNA-USA Division

**I**N MARCH 1992, UNA-USA announced the formation of its Division for Congressional and Corporate Programs and added to its staff Ralph L. Cwerman, who will oversee the new Division as Vice President. The Division's creation is a result of the merger of UNA-USA and Foundation Emmes.

Foundation Emmes, a New York-based research and public policy organization, was established in 1988 by Michael W. Sonnenfeldt, a New Jersey land developer. Under the stewardship of Mr. Cwerman, Executive Director of the Foundation, the organization targeted the congressional and corporate communities and sought to generate fresh thinking about the United Nations in the

post-cold war era. Through its innovative programs in New York and Washington, Foundation Emmes brought hundreds of U.S. business and government leaders together with senior U.N. officials for candid discussions of a wide array of issues affecting the world body.

In 1990, Michael Sonnenfeldt joined UNA-USA's Board of Governors and, working with UNA's leadership, paved the way for a number of highly successful joint programs. The close cooperation that developed between the two nonprofit organizations led to negotiations over a merger at the end of 1991. On March 1, 1992, UNA-USA Chair John C. Whitehead and Michael Sonnenfeldt formally announced the merger

and the formation of the Division for Congressional and Corporate Programs.

Welcoming the move, Mr. Whitehead said that "the new Division will strengthen UNA's voice significantly among two of its most important constituencies: the U.S. Congress and the business community." Mr. Sonnenfeldt added that "by combining the resources and innovative programs of the two organizations, the Division will raise considerably the level of congressional and corporate ties to the United Nations and set a new standard of awareness among these communities." He was pleased to transfer over \$200,000 in annual funding to cover the costs of the new Division.



Under the terms of the merger, Mr. Cwerman, a policy analyst specializing in U.N. and Mideast affairs, continues to coordinate the programs he developed at Foundation Emmes, which include the Capitol Hill Mixed Table Forums, Congressional Delegations Series, and Congressional Staff Seminars. "With the cold war behind us, and as we begin to redefine the role of the United Nations, it is increasingly significant to establish more effective cooperation between the U.S. Congress and the U.N.," said Cwerman. "It is equally significant to form a new partnership between the U.N. and the business community and to draw upon corporate expertise as the U.N. begins to tackle in earnest issues of trade, investment, energy, and the environment."

As head of the new Division, Cwerman is also charged with developing new forums for policy dialogues between and among the U.S. Congress, the U.N., and the business community. One recently established program is bringing together leading members of the corporate community and senior officials of the world organization.

Prior to joining Foundation Emmes, Cwerman served as Director of Research and Policy Planning at the Permanent Mission of Israel to the U.N. He lectures frequently on the Middle East and the United Nations and has published articles in newspapers and magazines around the country. Cwerman holds B.A. and M.A. degrees from Columbia University and a second master's degree from Tel Aviv University. He is fluent in Arabic and Hebrew.

Over the four busy months since setting up shop at UNA Headquarters, the Division has coordinated a number of new pro-

grams. The "Chairman's Council"—a continuing series of private briefings by world leaders for an audience of current and potential UNA members in the corporate community—was launched on May 11, when 15 senior business executives and UNA-USA's senior leaders met with former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at U.N. Headquarters. On the fall schedule are meetings with U.S. National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and Russia's Foreign Minister, Andrei Kozyrev.

UNA-USA's "Council of Fellows" was formed in May to reach out to young professionals in the business community and bring them into the U.N. community. Council Fellows meet once a month with an array of ambassadors and Secretariat officials to discuss a wide variety of U.N.-related issues. Among those addressing the Council in 1992 are Ambassador Rolf Ekeus, Chairman of the Special Commission on Iraq; former U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Thomas Pickering; Russia's Ambassador to the U.S., Vladimir Lukin; and former U.S. Secretary of State Frank Carlucci.

The Division will be initiating a series of special "UNA Travel Missions" to various U.N. field operations around the world. The first, scheduled for September 13-26, will take a small group of UNA leaders and members, corporate executives, and journalists to five U.N. peacekeeping sites around the world: Cyprus, Lebanon, Golan Heights, Cambodia, and El Salvador. Upon conclusion of the trip, UNA-USA will publish a report based on the mission's findings for distribution to UNA chapters and divisions.

(Anyone interested in joining the September trip should contact Ralph Cwerman at UNA Headquarters.)

In July and December each year the Division will coordinate "Congressional Delegations to the U.N.," a program that offers bipartisan groups of senators and representatives a full day of briefings at U.N. Headquarters with senior U.N. officials, including the Secretary-General and members of the Security Council. The Division also coordinates "Congressional Staff Briefings" on Capitol Hill, bringing together U.N. officials and key congressional staffers working on U.N.-related legislation. In the fall, by tradition, the process is reversed, with a group of senior staffers journeying to New York.

The Division will continue its special series of problem-solving sessions on Capitol Hill for members of Congress, U.N. officials, administration representatives, public policy experts, and the UNA leadership. These "UNA Mixed Tables" focus on a variety of multilateral concerns, such as peacekeeping, the environment, drug trafficking, U.N. reform, and humanitarian crises.

Finally, the Division is charged with planning special events as the opportunity may arise. Such an opportunity arose on May 11 as the new U.N. Secretary-General scheduled an inaugural official visit to Washington. UNA-USA held a reception for Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali in the capital, and invited UNA members in the Washington area to meet with him, along with members of Congress, the administration, and the Washington-based foreign diplomatic corps. ■

"Governments do not govern, but merely control the machinery of government, being themselves controlled by the hidden hand....The people are governed by very different personages than what is believed by those who are not behind the scenes."

- DISRAELI



## THE MONARCHY AND THE APOSTASY

by Fr Edward Black

This article by Fr Black is particularly relevant at present, given the current anti-Royalist agitation by a vocal minority in politics and the media. Whatever the moral and spiritual shortcomings of the House of Windsor, the critics of monarchy have not so far detailed any advantages that might accrue from republicanism. Nevertheless, the institution of monarchy remains under threat. Here in Britain, it is the prospect of European federalism that will reduce the sovereign to a mere "citizen" of Europe, while in our daughter nations overseas, particularly Australia, the forces striving for global control regard the last vestiges of the British world system as worthy of a particularly severe onslaught.

★

Forty years ago, on June 3, 1953, the Queen was crowned.

Although there are still a few reigning monarchs in today's world, there is no need to identify the one in question. The "Queen" is synonymous, throughout the entire world, with Queen Elizabeth II, who has come to be identified in the universal imagination — even in those countries which have never been directly under British influence — with the very concept of monarchy. The recent vicissitudes of the Royal family therefore attracted interest in every country, and have undoubtedly altered the public perception of the members of the Royal Family and their role. The institution of monarchy in Britain, and in Europe generally, is inseparably bound up with a particular Christian view of society, and its future must surely be a source of concern and interest for Traditional Catholics.

### The Monarchy in Britain

The Queen is unique among the Heads of State of the world in that she is crowned with solemn rites and ceremonies which represent more than a thousand years of the Christian history and tradition of her peoples. By a wonderful disposition of Providence, the English, and later British, monarchs have begun their reigns by a ceremony which, in its essentials, corresponds to the first English Coronation Service composed by St. Dunstan for King Edgar in 972, and in many of its details to the *Liber Regalis* or Coronation Ceremonial of the 14th century. It is therefore important to appreciate that the Coronation is not a Protestant service in the generally accepted sense — it is a beautiful and essentially Catholic expression of Britain's ancient Faith. Here is an unambiguous statement that authority comes from God, and an incomparable affirmation of the

universal Kingship of Christ, at the beginning of a new reign in the history of what has now become, in reality, a pagan country and a secular state. There is nowhere else in these days that a ruler is inaugurated with words such as:

"Receive this orb, set under the Cross, and remember that the whole world is subject to the power and empire of Christ our Redeemer."

or:

"Receive the ring of kingly dignity, and the seal of Catholic Faith: and as you are this day consecrated to be our Head and Prince, so may you continue steadfastly as the Defender of Christ's religion: that being blessed in all good works you may reign with Him Who is the King of Kings, to Whom be glory for ever and ever."

### The Monarchy and the Catholic Church

It must be observed that the very idea of monarchy is everywhere bound up with the notion of authority coming from above, even to the point of certain monarchs being presented to their peoples as being themselves divine. This was common in the ancient world and in the Orient. In Catholic Europe, the King became God's lieutenant, as far as the government of civil society was concerned. His authority came from God, for the simple reason that all legitimate authority is from God. (I Pet. 2:13). The King was solemnly blessed and consecrated during the elaborate coronation ritual, and was to rule as God's representative by divine, not arbitrary, right, but one which was founded on God's law, so that the king was correspondingly the subject of divine duty. The crown placed on his head could represent — as anyone who has exercised any kind of authority knows — as easily a crown of thorns as a crown of

glory. Today this notion of society has disappeared; all authority is challenged and questioned, the right to choose to obey or disobey is now the norm. Even before the Second Vatican Council, the Coronation ritual was omitted from the last edition of the *Pontificale Romanum*, on the ground that it is no longer relevant to modern times!

Although the Church does not officially endorse any particular form of government, and republics rule by divine right quite as much as monarchies, it requires a much shorter stretch of the imagination to see in the monarch a representative of the divine authority than it does to recognise the same in a group of politicians. In reality, the Church recognises this by the very fact of the Coronation Service. She has never provided for the president of any republic to be inaugurated with such solemnity. Indeed, how could She? For whereas a president represents the aspirations of a particular political party, and thence of a divided society, the king more closely reflects the government of God "the Lord and Father of all" (Eph. 4:6). For this reason it is a great mistake to discount the importance of the monarchy because it does not, as in Britain, exert actual political power. As a national symbol of unity and continuity, it can exercise a moral power much more effective than any politician could. Ceremonial at once inspires and fosters reverence and respect, and therefore it must maintain, as the British monarchy has until now successfully managed to do, all of the panoply of royal power and sacred symbol. No prime minister or president could inspire the same devotion and loyalty as does the Queen.

None of the Catholic monarchies now in existence have a prestige amongst their people comparable to the monarchy in Britain. This is partly to be explained by their



virtual absence of royal ceremonial and protocol. It may come as a surprise to many Catholics to learn that of the few surviving Catholic sovereigns in Europe, none are crowned, but they are rather inaugurated, after the manner of presidents. To this writer's knowledge, the last Catholic coronation took place in Budapest in 1916. The so-called "Catholic" states of Europe are no longer Catholic in any meaningful sense, and a conciliar Catholic sovereign is no guarantee of the official recognition of Catholic social virtues, as the retirement of the King of the Belgians for the time necessary to pass pro-abortion legislation amply demonstrates.

### The Monarchy and Protestantism

The monarchy as an institution is no more essentially protestant than is the United Kingdom itself. The fact that the Royal Family has become protestant and that Britain has been a champion of Protestantism since the Reformation, are, we may hope, infidelities of which one day the nation will relent and repent. The sovereign is not inextricably tied to the Church of England by any metaphysical bond, and even the titles "Head of the Church" or "Supreme Governor of the Church" should not be misunderstood. Article 37 does not give to the sovereign "the ministering of God's word or of the sacraments", therefore the Queen is not a clerical or ecclesiastical personage, even when considered in Protestant terms. This may be one reason why the Catholic King James II and VII, was allowed by both the Pope and the Protestant establishment to be crowned King by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in rites almost identical to the 1953 coronation of the present Queen, except, of course, that the communion service was omitted. Even the infamous Oath and Declaration denouncing Transubstantiation and the Veneration of Our Lady, which all monarchs from 1689 until 1902 were obliged to take before their coronation, may perhaps be explained as much by a sense of insecurity in the Church of England after the curious experience of having the Catholic James II as its Supreme Governor, as by pure hatred of the Catholic Church.

The present royal crisis has, once again, brought to the fore the question of the disestablishment of the Church of England, and if, as seems inevitable, this eventually takes place, the bond between it and the monarch will be broken. However, it is necessary to be realistic, and such a situation, far from being advantageous to Catholicism, or Christianity generally, will more likely be the public recognition of Britain as a secular State, in which case the Coronation Service will be retained merely as an historical pageant, in

all probability stripped of its Christian significance, or abolished as being the expression of the antiquated social concepts of a Christian minority.

### The Monarchy and the European Economic Community.

The most serious long-term threat to monarchy and the official recognition of any form of Christianity in the countries of Europe is the advent of the European Community. As presently established, it could never have come into being if there had still been official Catholic States in existence. How could the secular and amoral European court of Human Rights have coped with the affirmation of Divine Right in Catholic States? Now that these have disappeared, it is perhaps not too fanciful to imagine that the current exposure of the personal defects of members of the British Royal Family, and the corresponding loss of respect which such revelations entail, will create a situation where the monarchy will be forced to adopt a more egalitarian attitude, lose its emotional hold over the people, and be eliminated as a possible rallying point of opposition in Britain to the eventual creation of a 'United States' of Europe. It is obvious that a sovereign who is a citizen of the European union on the same footing as her subjects, is no longer a sovereign, even in a symbolic sense, and therefore has no reason to continue to exist.

### The Monarchy and Divorce

Of more immediate concern however, is the question of royal divorce. As everyone knows, Henry VIII's apostasy stemmed from his marital problems, and his foolhardy attempt to consolidate the power of the Crown at the expense of the Church. It would be ironic indeed if divorce should precipitate the fall of the House of Windsor. The present royal crisis is unsettling, not so much in the fact that most (or all) of the Queen's children lead lives which are less than morally perfect, but rather, that they have apparently lost all sense of their family and royal responsibilities. Queen Mary is reported to have been disappointed that men who had risked their lives and their all in the Great War would not be able to accept that Edward VIIIth as their King could not sacrifice his love for the divorcee Mrs Simpson. Not so long ago, Princess Margaret, "mindful of the Church's teaching", renounced her love for another divorcee, even although the Church of England's matrimonial teaching has never been clearly defined.

How times have changed! Now we have seen the Queen herself (and the Queen Mother, who only became Queen as result of the un-acceptability of royal divorce in

1936!) assist at the "remarriage" of her daughter, and now we even have the awesome prospect of a divorced King. It was perhaps, unrealistic to expect the younger members of the Royal family to be unaffected by the constant incitement to licentiousness which surrounds both them and all of us. Indeed, the constant encouragement to sexual immorality which pervades modern society is almost irresistible without the help of God's grace. Unfortunately the Royal Family in modern time, although distinguished since the reign of Queen Victoria by a high sense of natural duty, has never been particularly religious (no royal prince has ever entered Anglican Orders). Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes which the Queen has made was the public projection of the Royal Family as really not much different from any other affluent middle-class family. Her children, rather than being educated privately by tutors, and instilled with a highly developed sense of their royal duties, were sent to schools (albeit "smart" schools) where no doubt they adopted to a large extent the selfish and liberal values of their peers of the "sixties and post sixties" generations. How many parents of the Queen's generation find themselves in the same situation, witnessing the marital lives of their children in ruins? How many children of the generation of Prince William and Prince Harry have their grandmother as their last best hope?

As the symbol of national unity, the Royal Family must itself present a united image to the nation. The monarchy is based on a system of legitimacy and family cohesion, and therefore divorce and the acceptance of remarriage will bring about its inevitable destruction. The tabloid press is guilty of the most appalling hypocrisy in sensationalising Prince Charles' illicit love affairs, while at the same time publicising and promoting immorality of all kinds. This is, of course, the age-old tactic of Satan, who leads us on to sin and who — the moment we have fallen — transforms himself into an angel of light and becomes our most merciless accuser. Nevertheless, the intense interest in this publicity demonstrates a general awareness that the Prince and Princess of Wales have not only diminished their own personal reputations, but have undermined the monarchy itself.

### The Present Uncertainty

There is no prospect whatever of the present Royal House being replaced by another; far less any possibility of a Catholic Succession. The only alternative to the House of Windsor is a secular republic, and therefore it is imperative that it should not be de-stabilised by over-exposure of the personal weaknesses of its members. The disappearance of the British monarchy, or even its



relegation to the status of the "egalitarian" monarchies of Scandinavia or the Low Countries, would be an incalculable loss, not only to Britain, but to the world in general, as being the last Christian, political symbol of any significance.

The task of saving even this symbolic value of the monarchy will not now be easy. If, as appears at present, his marriage is irretrievable, the Prince of Wales will require heroic virtue to maintain his position. A divorced and re-married King is quite inconceivable in modern times, without changing the monarchy beyond recognition and severely diminishing its status. Even the largely amoral public of today would experience some difficulty in accepting as Queen one who was not the mother of the King's children and heirs, if their natural mother was still living. The precedent of King Henry the VIII's successful series of divorces is not of relevance to the modern situation, for the monarch has now no means of imposing his personal will on a nation which, in spite of its social and moral aberrations, this writer believes, still wishes to respect and revere its sovereign. The nation therefore expects him to act in such a manner as to make this possible. If henceforth Prince Charles was to devote his entire energies to the nation and to the exemplary execution of his royal duties, abandoning all illicit relationships and living a celibate life if his marriage cannot be saved, he would surely attract the sympathy of the people, preserve the work of the monarchy, and save his own soul in the process. If he is ever to reign successfully it must now literally be "by the grace of God."

Forty years after her coronation, the Queen faces her greatest trial. During these long years of admirable personal self-discipline and devotion to the manifold duties and demands of her office, she has reigned as an exemplary constitutional monarch. Sadly, however, in discharging this duty she has failed in another which is higher — that of upholding the reign of Our Lord, and refusing her assent to the immoral legislation of this reign, which has done incalculable harm to the family and the nation. As a result, she herself is now suffering these evil consequences in her own family, and as the nation itself is threatened, so is her role as its symbol. God will be her judge. However, her failures should no more put the monarchical institution in question any more than the failures and betrayals of the clergy should place in question the institution of the Church.

### Necessity of Prayer

When the Benedictine Sisters of Princethorpe landed in England as refugees from

the French Revolution, they were assisted by Mrs Fitzherbert and the then Prince of Wales, who asked that they pray for the King. They took this request seriously to heart, and (at least until the advent of the New Mass) they sang the Prayer for the King after the Daily Conventual Mass. Until the New Mass was established in the parish churches, this prayer was also recited at the principal Mass on Sunday in every church in Britain, and presumably — at least occasionally — in countries of the Commonwealth where the Queen is Head of State. This custom is continued in the churches of the Society of St. Pius X. Thus is fulfilled the injunction of St. Paul "I desire, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men: for Kings, and for all that are in high stations, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all

piety and chastity. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour". (1 Tim. 2:1-3)

During her "annus horribilis" speech in the Guildhall last Autumn, the Queen asked for prayers. During her Christmas broadcast she spoke of how the prayers and loyalty of her subjects had supported her in difficult times. It is indeed a blessing in these days to have a Head of State who makes reference to the value of prayer in any sense whatsoever. Let us therefore respond to this duty by imitating St. Edmund Campion, who, like all of the martyrs, was full of charity for one who was not only his monarch but even his persecutor, and who on the scaffold prayed for "Elizabeth, your Queen, and my Queen, unto whom I wish a long, quiet reign, and much prosperity."



*The Queen in her coronation robes against a backdrop of Westminster Abbey*

Reproduced with acknowledgement to Catholic, P.O. Box 36, Yarra Junction, Victoria 3797, Australia.



## LIVING WITHIN OUR MEANS

**NOEL HUNT** urges readers to remember that the next time a talking head speaks of "living within our means", if his lips are moving one may be sure he is lying!

POLITICIANS love telling us that "we must learn to live within our means" and reduce our public sector borrowing requirement. It makes them sound serious and statesmanlike. A flurry of weasel words after the statement reassures the greedy - that is to say, each of us - that his or her slice of the welfare cake will not be reduced in size. No politician has the courage to lay down that in future we will spend only what is collected in taxes. This is a sure way to lose votes. Better to chant the ritual mantra about our means and spend as extravagantly as ever.

The latest promise of economy was made a few weeks ago. Within two days it was reported that a bankrupt Britain, now reduced to Third World status, had promised to give another £600 million in aid. If we are to live within our means we cannot afford to give one penny in foreign aid. We are broke all the while we labour under a spending deficit of £50 billion. We do not have another £600 million. So we borrow it from the international bankers. By a stroke of the pen or a touch of the computer button they create the money out of nothing, and at that moment start charging us interest - usury - on the sum borrowed.

In world affairs today Britain carries about as much weight as Ghana or India. Yet we persist in giving ourselves all the airs and graces of a solvent first-class power. We borrow huge sums, cripple ourselves and our descendants with vast interest payments so that we can indulge in such idiocies as giving away enormous amounts of money to peoples who hate and despise us.

\*

\*

\*

\*

FOR once, it seems, there may be a drop in public expenditure. No doubt what is saved will be wasted elsewhere, but that is another story! A report recently issued by the Department of Health states that the feared epidemic of AIDS among heterosexuals has not happened. As a result, smaller amounts of money are to be allocated to "the fight against AIDS". There was, in fact, no fight against AIDS. There was a fight, but it was a propaganda battle to convince the unbelieving public that AIDS is as socially acceptable as the common cold. No less than £886 million of your taxes have been spent on this campaign since 1986. During this time 7,331 cases of AIDS were reported and 16,164 cases of HIV.

AIDS is incurable. Normal practice when confronted by a rapidly spreading and incurable disease is to set up quarantine centres. It will be recalled that when the AIDS question first came to public attention, all who spoke on the subject were at pains to stress that quarantine was, of course, "unthinkable". No other viewpoint was allowed to be heard. The only method of containing AIDS - quarantine - was not even considered because of the enormous power of the homosexual lobby. The report mentions that heterosexual intercourse accounts for only about ten per cent of AIDS cases. The others are, as everyone has long known, the result of buggery. The report says that



"thirty sexual contacts a night are not uncommon among homosexuals". But it would be unthinkable and horribly insensitive, of course, to quarantine people like this, wouldn't it?

Those who thought that the strongest pressure groups in Britain are the Jewish Board of Deputies or any of the "caring professions" will have to think again. The pro-homosexual lobby is at least as powerful as any other. Presumably as taxpayers we must resign ourselves to seeing huge amounts of our money wasted in ever more costly campaigns to convince us that AIDS is nothing to worry about; above all, that it carries no social stigma at all. If our spineless politicians were to set up quarantine centres, no doubt the European Court would veto the action under some conveniently formulated "human right". AIDS will be with us for a long time to come, and with it its ever-increasing burden on the ever-shrinking group of taxpayers.

\*

\*

\*

\*

THE latest proposals by the Home Secretary aimed at combatting juvenile crime will come as a disillusioning shock to anyone who takes politicians at their word when they talk about cutting spending. After all they have said about curbing public expenditure, one might have expected a proposal to beat juvenile crime by physically beating the juvenile criminal frequently and severely. Far from it!

It is proposed to set up five "secure training centres" with a total of two hundred places. "Offenders" - there are no longer criminals - will be committed to these centres for two years. Let us ask the question which should always spring to mind when we hear "far-reaching", "bold" and "innovative" suggestions such as this: "At whose expense?" Why, at yours, of course! Who else? Each juvenile committed will cost you about £2,000 a week (yes, that is correct) or £192,000 for two years. The total cost is estimated at about £21½ million annually, for ever.

Will these centres be staffed by retired warrant officers, physical training instructors and other confirmed disciplinarians? They will not. The aim of staff will be "to provide the care and personal attention that was lacking in the personal lives of many juvenile delinquents". This is political-speak meaning that staff will be semi-literate "carers" each armed with a diploma in some bogus "ology" and firmly convinced that there are no bad people, only bad laws which should be repealed because they irk "offenders". This is a typical liberal attempt at social engineering. It is based on the ridiculous assumption that people are basically good, made bad by a poor environment. Change the environment, says the social engineer and - as if by magic - one changes the person. It is by listening to such codswallop that we have been brought to our present plight.

We learn that after release, "juveniles will remain under close supervision until there are clear signs that their behaviour has altered". Presumably the supervision will come from the probation service, one of our worst administrative jokes. It is dedicated to the idea that society is to blame for everything and that all juveniles are lovable and misunderstood. But what happens, one may reasonably ask, if the little horror has not mended his ways? No problem - back he goes for another two years at a cost to you of £2,000 a week. So that's all right, isn't it?



The Home Secretary emphasised "there should be no soft options". The man is talking nonsense; what has been outlined above is a soft option. The hard option would be to make life so painful and so uncomfortable for the little wretch that he would rue the day he transgressed. However, even if one of the current crop of politicians could muster the nerve to do any such thing, no doubt the European Court would over-rule Westminster and quash his action.

So be prepared to pay higher taxes in whatever guise the new Chancellor of the Exchequer presents them. Heeding the ravings of the penologists and being "at the very heart of Europe" is no doubt very trendy and exciting. Unfortunately, it is very costly as well. An old adage says, "'Take what thou wilt,' saith God, 'take it and pay for it.'" This is as true today as when it was first coined centuries ago.

---

#### **CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE PRIME MINISTER'S WASTE-PAPER BIN**

"DEAR Mr Major - I have just heard on Radio Four news that you have issued a statement to the effect that you do not want to be part of a 'sour little England'. May I suggest, therefore, that you depart forthwith to Brussels along with your mega-banker friends before you do any further damage to this country and to the people whom you are supposed to represent? You are fully aware that it is no part of the duties of a British Prime Minister to hand over British sovereignty (the birthright of the people) to further the alien interests which manipulated you into your office - Mrs Sylvia Noble."

"DEAR Mrs Noble - The Prime Minister has asked me to thank you for your recent letter, the terms of which will be carefully noted. Mr Major has asked that your letter be passed to the Department with particular responsibility for the matter you raise so that they, too, are aware of your views - M Chrysostamar [Correspondence Secretary]."

"DEAR Mr Major - Thank you for your prompt reply. I am amazed to know there is actually a department with particular responsibility for the matter I raised, viz. to look into the feasibility of moving you permanently to Brussels. This is indeed good news as I had no idea that my opinion was so widely endorsed. May I take this opportunity of suggesting that the Muslim 'parliament' in Britain be likewise removed to Pakistan where it belongs and that supporters of the 'fatwa' against a 'British' citizen be duly charged under the law? Thank you in anticipation of your co-operation - Mrs Sylvia Noble."

---

#### **CITY SLICKERS WAX FAT ON TAX RAP**

"SIR - I find the City's fat complacent tone highly offensive. 'Of course' the taxpayer will be delighted to shell out £1,000 million for the [I.R.A.] bomb damage because the City cannot be expected to pay for proper insurance policies to cover the damage. If the City really makes as many billions 'for Britain' as it claims, then it can pay out £1 billion for the damage. I have to pay all my own insurance and I am a lot poorer than the people in the City who will benefit from this handout by the taxpayer. If 'sink or swim' goes for me, then it should go for them - George Stern, London N6."

- Sunday Telegraph, May 2nd.



## THE WAY OF THE WORLD

### Gleanings from the Candour Press Desk

**ROTTEN APPLE** - "New Yorkers were compared yesterday to 'combat infantrymen' numbed by violence and a breakdown of social order. Senator Daniel Moynihan, who grew up in New York where he shined shoes on Times Square, spoke out at a meeting of the Association for a Better New York. He said that the 'near-narcoleptic state' of the citizens 'diminished the human condition'. Recalling his boyhood years, he said the city had the best subways, the best schools, the best housing 'and in many ways the best-behaved citizenry'. Now, he said, 'there are parts of the city where families have disappeared, and the social chaos that comes in the aftermath of the inability to socialise the young males is all around us and growing worse'.

"He recalled that in 1943, 44 people were killed by guns in New York. Last year, the figure was 1,499. Half-a-century ago, 73,000 people were on government welfare assistance. Now there were a million. In 1943 the percentage of babies born out of wedlock was three; today it was 45 for the city and as high as 80 in some suburbs. New York's black mayor, David Dinkins, was frosty about the speech. 'The good days weren't so good. I wore the uniform of a United States marine and I had to sit in the back of the bus.'" - **Daily Telegraph**, 17/4/93. [So what if you did have to ride on the back seat, Mr Mayor? Nowadays you are 34 times more likely to stop a bullet. Some civil rights!]

**MAASTRICHT AND BEYOND** - "A constitution for a United States of Europe, going way beyond Maastricht, was unveiled in the Euro-parliament as self-confidence returns to the Brussels federalists. Amid increasing signs that the treaty will now survive Danish and British ratifications, a new draft 'Constitution for European Union' would place massive powers in the hands of the Commission president and even award the Euro-parliament the right to raise taxes in Britain and other E.C. countries." - **Weekly Telegraph**, 7/3/93. [Britain's Graveyard, Common Market Suicide, call it what you will. E.C. membership spells the death of sovereignty by slow yet remorseless strangulation and holding a referendum will do nothing but slacken the assassins' grip momentarily. If in doubt, ask the Danes.]

**MASONRY AND THE MONARCHY** - "An awfully intriguing item in **Royalty** reported that on this past May 24, Princess Diana was to attend a charity performance of Mozart's **The Magic Flute**, an opera full of Masonic symbolism, at Freemasons Hall in London. The item starts becoming interesting when it reminds **Royalty's** readers that Prince Philip, Charles' father, is a Mason, but Charles is not. The magazine does not say it, but it has been reported that the refusal of Charles to join the Lodge put a permanent strain on his relationship with his father. Then it reports a special reason for Diana going to Freemasons Hall: 'From talking to the Duke of Edinburgh and the Duke of Kent, she is known to be interested in the Masons and has discussed whether her sons should become members.'" - **The Remnant**, 31/5/93.

[The writer proceeds to speculate whether Prince Charles' refusal of initiation into the Lodge and his supposed sympathy towards Catholicism led to the 'bugging' of the very rooms in which he lives. Who would, or could, 'bug' the heir to the throne? Is it possible that he



was 'bugged' by his own family? These questions, joined to the news that Princess Diana is footsying with Freemasons Hall, does suggest the possibility of a Masonic campaign to make Charles feel obliged one distant day to step aside for a son who is imbued with the principles of the Craft, not to mention all the other one-world conditioning he is likely to receive.]

**POLITICALLY CORRECT CHAOS** - "[There is] a growing body of evidence that Hilary Clinton, the president's wife, is orchestrating a politically-correct quota system, picking candidates for dozens of powerful government jobs by race, gender and even attitude to sexual preference. 'It has got to the stage where Hilary does not actually have to say what she wants,' said a senior official. 'Once everyone knows what the president's wife expects, then that is what everyone works towards.' Job after job is being left open as the White House hunts for women, blacks or Hispanics who are even vaguely qualified. As a result, the government is paralysed.

"The aim of the quotas is to produce a generation of black, female and Hispanic role models in government. Although the president reviews every appointment, he appears to have conceded considerable authority to a troika of his wife, her close friend Susan Thomases, who is a lawyer, and Marian Wright Edelman, the liberal-left head of the Children's Defence Fund. Thomases, who has no official post, is a regular visitor to the White House second floor where Hilary works." - **Sunday Times**, 28/2/93. [Who on earth is Susan Thomases? Another behind the scenes operator like Harry Dexter White? Perhaps next she will advise the President, via the First and Fierce Lady, to change the name of the White House to the Black House, or even the Coffee House.]

**METHODS OF EMPIRE HOLD TRUE** - "The war in Bosnia is a year old. No one understands it. The United Nations has failed almost totally in its efforts to bring it to an end. These bald facts interconnect. The U.N. has failed to check the horrors of the Bosnian war because it cannot identify what sort of war it is. Not being able to, it has pursued strategies and deployed forces that cannot deal with the problems encountered. The distinguishing marks of the Bosnian fighting are territorial displacement - driving populations from their villages, which are then destroyed or left abandoned - the humiliation and mistreatment of women, indiscriminate massacre and the satisfaction of revenge. Each of these practices so alien and horrifying to humane opinion, is well known to the few anthropologists who make 'primitive warfare their field of study.

"That such primitivism has surfaced should not surprise us. Dark forces lurk behind the mask of even the most civilised societies, but the Balkans was a savage land until the last century. If the tribal nature of the Bosnian war is recognised, the U.N.'s failure becomes explicable. Its representatives are treating Serb tribal strongmen as responsible and rational leaders. They should be treated instead - at a personal level - by the old-fashioned methods of carrot and stick practised by generations of district officers in the tribal lands of Empire. Significantly, the two U.N. contingents which appear to have some success in controlling the strongmen are the British and French, which still preserve memories of imperial methods. Translating the U.N. peacemaking effort into an effective neo-imperial system would require a re-structuring, probably through a return to the Mandate method." - **Daily Telegraph**, 15/4/93.



## SO NOW WE KNOW WHO STARTED THE WAR!

"SIR - Writing as one who was in a ship at anchor off the French coast four hours before the D-Day invasion started, may I suggest that Chancellor Kohl and his entire government be invited to attend all events? Afterwards, every expense, from the cost of H.M. Yacht Britannia to the smallest posy placed on a grave, should then be sent to him for payment. After all, Germany started the war, and without his nation there would be no need for a celebration - Capt the Rev D.A. Farquharson-Roberts."

Readers will perhaps need some convincing that this letter, printed in the **Daily Telegraph** on 3 July, did not appear in Peter Simple's column!

---

**SEARCHLIGHT:** June 1992 and May 1993 issues needed for our files. Full price and postage paid. Please send to Candour Research Dept.

**READ SPEARHEAD.** Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy £1 from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

**TAPES FROM FOREST HOUSE.** Send an s.a.e. for our list of cassette tapes featuring the voices of A.K. Chesterton, David Irving, Fr Charles Coughlin, Bishop Richard Williamson and Charles Lindbergh.

**READ CATHOLIC ACTION.** Issue 2 includes articles on Fr Fahey, Fatima and Rerum Novarum. £1.50 from P.O. Box 184, Dover, Kent CT16 1NQ.

**FREEDOM VIDEOS.** A wide range of nationalist and revisionist VHS videos available in our latest sales list. Send an s.a.e. to Freedom Videos, B.M. Truth, London WC1N 3XX.

**REMARKS** reports revisionist stories suppressed by the establishment media. Jack Wikoff, its editor, has just been added by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to its "bad boy" list. U.K. airmail subscription \$30 from P.O. Box 234, Aurora, N.Y. 13026-0234, U.S.A.

**READ MAMMON VERSUS GOD.** Sub-titled "The Bankers' New World Disorder", this new booklet by Dr Kitty Little frankly exposes the forces behind usury, the undermining of Christianity and the fuss about "war crimes". Only £1.25 from Inter-City Research Press, 31 Eastvale, Second Avenue, Acton Vale, London W3 7RU.

**MERRIE ENGLAND 2,000.** This book by Colin Jordan is a fictional anticipation of the bizarre shape of cosmopolitan Britain in the 21st century. £1.30 from Gothic Ripples, Thorgarth, Greenhow Hill, Harrogate, North Yorkshire HG3 5JQ.

---

**CANDOUR needs more readers. Have you secured another subscriber yet? Also, have you asked your local library to order CANDOUR?**

---

### CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

|          |              |                   |           |
|----------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|
| U.K. £12 | OVERSEAS £15 | U.S. \$25 AIRMAIL | PER ANNUM |
|----------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|

---

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD. [Editor: Rosine de Bouneville]